



RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named  
Inventor : TeckHock Ng et al.

Appln. No.: 09/893,262

Filed : June 27, 2001

For : RETRIEVAL OF A SINGLE  
COMPLETE COPY FROM MULTIPLE  
STORED COPIES OF INFORMATION

Docket No.: S01.12-0714/STL 9766

Group Art Unit: 2114

Examiner: Dieu Minh  
T. Le

**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING  
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450,  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, THIS

21<sup>st</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2005

*A. Rego*  
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 21, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-20 were rejected and claims 4 and 14 were objected to. The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4 and 14 is appreciated. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1-20.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,434,487 in view of Shin, U.S. Patent No. 6,101,619.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the